

# **Exhibit 52**

CONFIDENTIAL - EVAN MILAZZO 30(b)(6)  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

In re: :  
: Master File No.  
Global Brokerage, Inc. : 1:17-cv-00916-RA  
F/k/a FXCM, Inc. :  
Securities Litigation :  
----- :

REMOTE VIDEO DEPOSITION VIA ZOOM OF:  
EVAN MILAZZO PURSUANT TO RULE 30(b)(6)  
TUESDAY, DECEMBER 1, 2020

REPORTED BY:  
SILVIA P. WAGE, CCR, CRR, RPR

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 46</p> <p>1 CONFIDENTIAL - EVAN MILAZZO 30(b)(6)</p> <p>2 referred to as API?</p> <p>3 A. No, an adapter is a type of API.</p> <p>4 Q. And were these adapters for APIs made</p> <p>5 available to any other liquidity providers in</p> <p>6 EFFEX?</p> <p>7 A. We had APIs with all of our liquidity</p> <p>8 providers that were based off of fixed protocol</p> <p>9 including EFFEX. The adapters that I am</p> <p>10 referring to were custom built and offered to</p> <p>11 EFFEX only.</p> <p>12 Q. How did EFFEX's requirements for</p> <p>13 access to FXCM's systems differ from other</p> <p>14 liquidity providers, if they did?</p> <p>15 MR. DAHAN: Objection to form.</p> <p>16 A. Sorry. You mentioned -- can you</p> <p>17 repeat that? You said requirements for EFFEX's</p> <p>18 access; is that right?</p> <p>19 Q. How did EFFEX's requirements for</p> <p>20 access to FXCM's systems differ from other</p> <p>21 liquidity providers, if they did?</p> <p>22 A. So the only requirements that EFFEX</p> <p>23 had for integration with FXCM would have been the</p> <p>24 ability to send streaming quotes and receive</p> <p>25 orders from FXCM, which would have been the same</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 48</p> <p>1 CONFIDENTIAL - EVAN MILAZZO 30(b)(6)</p> <p>2 Q. Would it have been a CFV or comma</p> <p>3 delimited database file or something different?</p> <p>4 A. Something different than that.</p> <p>5 Q. Did FXCM at this time or at anytime</p> <p>6 between 2010 and 2014 have responsibilities for</p> <p>7 administration of EFFEX software?</p> <p>8 A. Not to my knowledge, no.</p> <p>9 Q. So, when you reference here a clear</p> <p>10 delineation of responsibilities for admin of the</p> <p>11 EFFEX software, what did you mean?</p> <p>12 A. I was referring most likely to the</p> <p>13 hardware itself. Maybe I miswrote there. But</p> <p>14 FXCM never administered the EFFEX software. But</p> <p>15 there was a period of time where FXCM extended</p> <p>16 services to help host the EFFEX systems, in which</p> <p>17 case FXCM was helping to administer the hardware</p> <p>18 and infrastructure for EFFEX.</p> <p>19 Q. But at no time did FXCM have any hand</p> <p>20 in administering any software on behalf of EFFEX?</p> <p>21 A. Could you define what you mean by</p> <p>22 "administering"? It's kind of a rather general</p> <p>23 term.</p> <p>24 Q. I mean, in a rather general sense.</p> <p>25 Did FXCM personnel have to, for</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 47</p> <p>1 CONFIDENTIAL - EVAN MILAZZO 30(b)(6)</p> <p>2 as any sort of fix integration we would have done</p> <p>3 with any liquidity provider.</p> <p>4 Q. And the adapters that FXCM developed</p> <p>5 for EFFEX in this case, did those connect to a</p> <p>6 particular piece of software or interface?</p> <p>7 A. So the adapters themselves were</p> <p>8 pieces of software on the side that let's say</p> <p>9 faced FXCM. They connected to the multicast bus</p> <p>10 that I mentioned earlier. And then they were</p> <p>11 delivered out to an adapter that would have sat</p> <p>12 inside of the EFFEX system so we were able to</p> <p>13 translate the messages from internal FXCM form to</p> <p>14 something that was digestible by EFFEX.</p> <p>15 Q. And do you know if the adapter</p> <p>16 translated that data into format that was</p> <p>17 readable by any other software program or</p> <p>18 platform?</p> <p>19 A. I believe that it was pretty</p> <p>20 straightforward and easy to use API. So it could</p> <p>21 have been used by any party to whom we provided</p> <p>22 that interface to.</p> <p>23 Q. And what format was the data provided</p> <p>24 in through the adapter?</p> <p>25 A. I don't know the exact format.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 49</p> <p>1 CONFIDENTIAL - EVAN MILAZZO 30(b)(6)</p> <p>2 instance, make changes or updates to software to</p> <p>3 maintain the adapters you previously discussed?</p> <p>4 A. So, just to be clear, those adapters</p> <p>5 were inside of the FXCM system. So they were</p> <p>6 FXCM software.</p> <p>7 Q. But they were custom made for access</p> <p>8 by EFFEX, correct?</p> <p>9 A. They were custom made for us to</p> <p>10 deliver data to EFFEX.</p> <p>11 Q. Okay. Did any FXCM personnel work</p> <p>12 with personnel from EFFEX to craft those custom</p> <p>13 adapters for EFFEX's use?</p> <p>14 MR. DAHAN: Objection to form.</p> <p>15 A. Yes, obviously, there was some level</p> <p>16 of collaboration that was required.</p> <p>17 Q. Did FXCM provide personnel to EFFEX</p> <p>18 in connection with the development of these</p> <p>19 adapters?</p> <p>20 A. Again, just to be clear, the adapters</p> <p>21 that we've been discussing so far were FXCM</p> <p>22 software. So they were created by FXCM</p> <p>23 personnel.</p> <p>24 Q. Did at anytime FXCM provide personnel</p> <p>25 to EFFEX to assist in the implementation of these</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 118</p> <p>1 CONFIDENTIAL - EVAN MILAZZO 30(b)(6)</p> <p>2 repeat that question. I think you said when</p> <p>3 EFFEX co-located with other liquidity providers.</p> <p>4 MR. LaPOINTE: Let me make sure.</p> <p>5 I'll strike the previous one and attempt to</p> <p>6 rephrase.</p> <p>7 MR. DAHAN: Okay.</p> <p>8 Q. Would other price providers -- sorry.</p> <p>9 When other price providers began to</p> <p>10 co-locate with EFFEX, did they receive the same</p> <p>11 enhanced access to being FXCM's systems that</p> <p>12 EFFEX was granted as described earlier in your</p> <p>13 testimony?</p> <p>14 MR. DAHAN: Brent, again, they don't</p> <p>15 co-locate with EFFEX. I think you meant did they</p> <p>16 co-locate with FXCM.</p> <p>17 MR. LaPOINTE: That may be true.</p> <p>18 Strike again.</p> <p>19 Q. Would other price providers -- when</p> <p>20 other price providers began to co-locate with</p> <p>21 FXCM, did they receive the same enhanced access</p> <p>22 to FXCM's systems that EFFEX was granted that was</p> <p>23 described earlier in your testimony?</p> <p>24 A. So, no, that's not just a natural</p> <p>25 effect of co-location itself. EFFEX was still</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 120</p> <p>1 CONFIDENTIAL - EVAN MILAZZO 30(b)(6)</p> <p>2 exactly the same way so that the frequency with</p> <p>3 updates and the best bid and offer doesn't depend</p> <p>4 on the latency from the liquidity provider</p> <p>5 itself.</p> <p>6 Q. So moving on to the paragraph below</p> <p>7 that labeled, "Depth of Liquidity." This begins,</p> <p>8 "FXCM insists that EFFEX match the best bid or</p> <p>9 best offer from FXCM's other liquidity providers</p> <p>10 over 80 percent of the time for major currency</p> <p>11 payors and almost 100 percent of the time for</p> <p>12 currency crosses."</p> <p>13 Do you see that?</p> <p>14 A. Yes, I do.</p> <p>15 Q. How was this accomplished, this</p> <p>16 insistence?</p> <p>17 A. How was the insistence accomplished?</p> <p>18 Q. Yes.</p> <p>19 A. So we had a liquidity management team</p> <p>20 who corresponded regularly with all of our</p> <p>21 liquidity providers. If this was one of the</p> <p>22 objectives that was set forth for EFFEX, than</p> <p>23 that would have been communicated to them and</p> <p>24 then we would have been monitoring that through</p> <p>25 the reports that the liquidity management team</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 119</p> <p>1 CONFIDENTIAL - EVAN MILAZZO 30(b)(6)</p> <p>2 providing higher quality service in terms of</p> <p>3 pricing, execution, rejection rates, et cetera,</p> <p>4 than the other providers. Like I said earlier,</p> <p>5 if they had requested it, we would have</p> <p>6 considered it. But just as a result of</p> <p>7 co-location, that didn't happen.</p> <p>8 Q. But, to your knowledge, no other</p> <p>9 liquidity providers ever requested it?</p> <p>10 MR. DAHAN: Requested what?</p> <p>11 MR. LaPOINTE: That enhanced access.</p> <p>12 MR. DAHAN: Oh, okay.</p> <p>13 A. Yeah, again, I'm not sure.</p> <p>14 Q. As a result of reduced latency during</p> <p>15 the time when EFFEX was the sole price provider</p> <p>16 that was co-located with FXCM's servers, were</p> <p>17 EFFEX's changes in pricing reflected more quickly</p> <p>18 than other liquidity providers?</p> <p>19 A. Yes, they would have been, if you</p> <p>20 look at it from the perspective of how long it</p> <p>21 took for that quote to get from EFFEX to the FXCM</p> <p>22 system versus how long it took for the quote to</p> <p>23 get from the liquidity provider to FXCM. But</p> <p>24 inside -- once the quotes were inside of the FXCM</p> <p>25 network, all quotes are treated and handled in</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 121</p> <p>1 CONFIDENTIAL - EVAN MILAZZO 30(b)(6)</p> <p>2 put together to communicate that to EFFEX and</p> <p>3 make sure that they were upholding that metric.</p> <p>4 Q. Was there a written agreement between</p> <p>5 FXCM and EFFEX that proscribed that metric?</p> <p>6 A. I'm not certain.</p> <p>7 Q. Alright. I'm going to show you</p> <p>8 another document.</p> <p>9 MR. DAHAN: Yeah, Brent, just so you</p> <p>10 know, I'm going to cut out in five minutes. I</p> <p>11 have a client call for a half hour, but Chelsea</p> <p>12 will continue.</p> <p>13 MR. LaPOINTE: Okay.</p> <p>14 MR. DAHAN: And I'll be back around</p> <p>15 4:45.</p> <p>16 MR. LaPOINTE: That's fine. I'll</p> <p>17 expect we'll still be going at that point.</p> <p>18 (Deposition Exhibit 15, e-mail to</p> <p>19 Matt Childers from Alexander Dick GLBR_00041753</p> <p>20 to GLBR_00041757 marked Confidential, was marked</p> <p>21 for identification.)</p> <p>22 Q. So I'm marking this as Exhibit</p> <p>23 No. 15. Once again, just let me know when you're</p> <p>24 able to see it. And I'll give you some time to</p> <p>25 review.</p>